

California State University, San Bernardino

**CSUSB ScholarWorks**

---

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

---

1994

## **An investigation of socio-psychological factors that influence adolescent gang membership**

Tanja Ballinger

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#), and the [Psychology Commons](#)

---

### **Recommended Citation**

Ballinger, Tanja, "An investigation of socio-psychological factors that influence adolescent gang membership" (1994). *Theses Digitization Project*. 859.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/859>

This Project is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@csusb.edu](mailto:scholarworks@csusb.edu).

**AN INVESTIGATION OF SOCIO-PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS  
THAT INFLUENCE ADOLESCENT GANG MEMBERSHIP**

---

**A Thesis  
Presented to the  
Faculty of  
California State University,  
San Bernardino**

---

**In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Arts  
in  
Psychology**

---

**by  
Tanja Ballinger  
March 1995**

AN INVESTIGATION OF SOCIO-PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS  
THAT INFLUENCE ADOLESCENT GANG MEMBERSHIP

---

A Thesis  
Presented to the  
Faculty of  
California State University,  
San Bernardino


---


by  
Tanja Ballinger  
March 1995

Approved by:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. Elizabeth Klonoff, Chair, Psychology

3/15/95  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. David Chavez

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dr. Joanna Worthley

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to identify socio-psychological differences in youths who may be at risk for joining gangs. Students from a local junior high school served as participants (N=415). It was hypothesized that those respondents who reported being in a gang (gang member) or had a desire to become a gang member ("wanna-be" group) would have a greater need for companionship, protection, and excitement than non-gang members. Additionally, gang members and "wanna-be's" would report having more family problems and a greater number of fatalistic expectations than non-gang members. MANOVA's and follow-up ANOVA's were used to analyze the data. Results from the questionnaires given to the participants supported all the hypotheses. Also, a substantial number of respondents who were grouped as gang members or "wanna-be's" reported having more family members who were or currently are in a gang than non-members. Results also indicated that participation in an extra-curricular activity could help protect a youth from becoming a gang members. Suggestions for future research regarding adolescent gang membership are discussed.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Every once in a while, you meet someone that just incredibly influences your life and gives you guidance and hope to set and accomplish goals. Dr. Elizabeth Klonoff was that kind of person in my life. Never before, have I ever met someone who was so willing to help out another, and gave of her time and support, so unselfishly. Without her faith, trust, and confidence in me, completing this project and graduating with a Master's Degree would not have become a reality for me. I thank you Liz, for all your patience and caring and for continuing to believe in me, even when I doubted myself, so many times. And I thank God for putting you in my path, so that you could be both a mentor and an inspiration to me.

I am also very grateful for Dr. David Chavez and Dr. Joanna Worthley for their participation on the committee and for providing me with the feedback I needed to produce a final and cohesive manuscript.

I would also like to thank my parents and family for their unceasing love, guidance and support for many, many years and throughout some very difficult times in my life. I have been abundantly blessed with a wonderful family - Thank you all, so much!

Last, and by no means least, I do thank the Lord for putting the desire in me to further my education and for giving me the wisdom to discern the Truth, and the perseverance to continue on. In all that I do, my hearts desire is to glorify You - for You are deserving of all the praises Lord.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES .....	vi
INTRODUCTION.....	1
What Is A Gang? .....	5
Why Do Some Youths Join Gangs? .....	7
Companionship.....	10
Protection.....	11
Excitement.....	11
Fatalism.....	12
Hypotheses.....	14
METHOD.....	15
Subjects.....	15
Measures.....	15
Procedure.....	17
RESULTS.....	18
Gang-Affiliated Factors .....	18
Fatalistic Expectation .....	21
Family Problems .....	23
DISCUSSION.....	25
APPENDICES.....	38
A: Demographics .....	38
B: Gang-Affiliation Questionnaire .....	39
C: Junior Sensation-Seeking Scale (JSSS) .....	42
D: Network of Relationships Inventory (NRI) .....	45
E: Index of Family Relations (IFR) .....	47
F: Informed Consent .....	49
G: Debriefing Statement .....	50
REFERENCES.....	51

## LIST OF TABLES

- TABLE 1. Rotated Sorted Factors:  
Gang-Affiliated Factors.
- TABLE 2. MANOVA and ANOVA of Gang Members, "Wanna-Be's" and  
Non-Members on Gang-Affiliated Factors.
- TABLE 3. MANOVA and ANOVA of Gang Members, "Wanna-Be's" and  
Non-Members on the Network of Relationships  
Inventory.
- TABLE 4. MANOVA and ANOVA of Gang Members, "Wanna-Be's" and  
Non-Members on the Junior Sensation-Seeking Scale.
- TABLE 5. MANOVA and ANOVA of Gender differences on Gang-  
Affiliated Factors.
- TABLE 6. MANOVA and ANOVA of Ethnic Differences on Gang-  
Affiliated Factors.

## INTRODUCTION

The street gang is progressively becoming a force working against established institutions such as family, school, and church to influence and misdirect adolescent self-identification for an alarming number of young people with problematic backgrounds. The youth gangs of today cross all socio-economic classes and ethnic groups (Morash, 1983; Moore, Vigil & Garcia, 1983; Riley & Harrell, 1990). Daily there are stories in either print media or television related to gang violence. News events describing gang activities usually involve gang fights, drugs, vandalism, and often, murder. It is not surprising that our criminal justice system lists youth gang crimes as one of the most serious problems facing our communities today (California Council on Criminal Justice, 1989). For those who become involved with gangs, the gang functions as a driving element which shapes what a recruit thinks about himself and others.

A youth's peer group is such an influential reference group and source of identity that the nature of the crowd with which an adolescent affiliates with will impact his or her behavior and self-concept (Erikson, 1968; Elkind, 1980). Condry and Siman (1974) report that peers are a powerful and possibly an underestimated source of influence in the socialization of a minor. A youth's perception of his or



her appearance to a particular group of people, or a particular and significant individual, constitutes a major ingredient of their evolving personal identity. It contains elements of how they wish to be seen by other people. They might be said to have as many identities as there are groups or significant individuals who they believe have a distinctive way of perceiving them (Elkind, 1978).

Much has been written about adolescent identity formation. Erikson (1968) sees the adolescent period as one of a sequence of stages in the life cycle with a particular challenge or task to be met. For the teenager, it is the challenge between "identity" and "identity diffusion". In leaving behind their childish roles, adolescents are thought to become preoccupied with finding for themselves a satisfactory answer to the question "who am I?" They may try out a variety of identities in their search for answers; they seek experience in different roles and through a variety of relationships. It is a period of self exploration through experimentation.

Davis, Weener, and Shute (1977) feel that the peer group is often the primary source for attitudes, values, and behaviors that serve as a mechanism for decision-making. They indicate that children with a positive outlook and a positive attitude toward their environment will respond more strongly against peer pressure. In order to understand

adolescent development, it is necessary to discern how adolescents form their peer groups, as well as to understand what takes place within groups' self-imposed boundaries. Brown and his colleagues (1988) report that peer groups affect the adolescent's development and behavior. They have concluded that although most adolescents feel pressure from their friends to behave in ways that are consistent with their peer's values and goals, the specific nature of the pressure varies from one affiliation to the next.

Most adolescents will belong to a peer group. A minor's peer group is usually organized around a clique or a small group, ranging from two to twelve individuals who are generally of the same sex and age (Dunphy, 1975; Hollingshead, 1975). Berndt (1981) reports that adolescents and their friends usually listen to the same type of music, dress similarly, spend their leisure time engaged in similar types of activities, and share similar patterns of drug usage. In general, adolescents tend to associate with people who are from similar backgrounds and who share similar interests and activities (Dunphy, 1975; Elkind, 1978; Youniss, 1980; Elkind, 1980). A peer group, for instance, could be a team, a club, a neighborhood gang, or a small circle of friends. Peer groups usually function under an unwritten charter characterized by similar goals of interests; the same is true of street gangs.

In California, there are approximately 600-800 gangs. Gang membership in Los Angeles alone is estimated at 50,000 (California Council on Criminal Justice, 1986). Increasingly, adolescent gangs are using automatic weapons for the commission of gang-related crimes. One of the most frightening crimes committed in our streets is the "drive-by shooting". This occurs when one gang seeks out the home, vehicle, or "hang-out" of a rival gang. While using a variety of automatic weapons gang members drive by and shoot indiscriminately. In many instances, innocent people are accidentally and intentionally wounded or killed; those who are targeted are usually among the wounded or dead.

Despite the criminal affiliation, street gangs are currently acclaimed as powerful adolescent networks that provides their members with camaraderie, a sense of purpose, socialization skills, and loyalty in the same way that communal, professional, religious, and school-sponsored organizations do (Riley & Harrell, 1990). And, just as adults exercise their liberty to choose participation in any organization, minors believe they also have that same right, and are therefore inclined to join together in formal and informal organizations, as long as they are not breaking the law (Riley, 1991).

According to Vigil (1988), the older street youths become the major socialization and enculturation agents for

new gang members. The gang becomes a partial substitute for the family by providing emotional and social support networks. Vigil (1988) suggests that the experience of belonging to a gang creates a new social identity and personal identity. Much of the gang image and patterns, that is, the dress, gestures, mannerisms, language, walking style, nicknames, and graffiti, becomes an important source of identification. For street youths, the gang, with both its good and bad features, becomes a coping mechanism to relieve social pressures and to develop opportunities for personal fulfillment (Vigil, 1988; Caughey, 1980).

#### **WHAT IS A GANG?**

Devising a clear definition of the term "gang" is one of the most vexing problems relevant to gang research. Ever since social-scientists first began to study gangs, the definition of what characterized a gang has been ambiguous. One of the earliest and most frequently cited definitions of a gang is that of Frederick Thrasher (1927). Thrasher defined a gang as "a group that forms spontaneously and without any special attachment to existing parts of society" (1927, pg. 18). Gangs, according to Thrasher, are "interstitial"; they form in the "cracks" of the social fabric, at the boundaries of society. Thrasher believed that conflict united individuals into gangs because it provided common labels and common enemies. Thrasher's

definition is important because of its influence on decades of research and thinking on gangs and gang activities.

Other uses of the term "gang" have been very general. The term "gang" has sometimes been used to signify a group of close associates or friends, with no negative implications, especially not those implying criminal intent (Bynum & Thompson, 1988). According to Lalli & Savitz (1976), "the term 'gang' has become a pejorative label applied to a group of associated individuals who are presumed to engage in "bad" or socially undesirable behavior; the term was not always negatively loaded, but it has become a term of opprobrium" (pg. 411-412).

Yablonsky depicted juvenile gangs as "near groups". He stated that "delinquent gangs are portrayed as being poorly organized and ill-defined" (1959, pg. 108). Hence, Yablonsky characterized gangs as "lying on a continuum of social structures between well organized groups and mobs" (Brownfield & Thompson, 1991, pg. 47).

On the other hand, Miller (1962) suggested that illegal activity is a crucial element of the definition of gangs. According to Miller, "a gang is a group of recurrently associating individuals with identifiable leadership and internal organization, identifying with or claiming control over territory in the community and engaging either individually or collectively in violent or other forms of

illegal behavior" (1962, pg. 169). Miller's definition distinguishes gangs from friendship groups, athletic teams, and the like, and is based on criteria used by criminal justice personnel who work with gangs (Campbell & Muncer, 1989).

The lack of agreement on the definition of the term "gang" impacts what can be inferred about gang behavior. If too broad a definition is used, then a wide variety of groups, such as college fraternities, athletic teams, play groups, street corner groups, and other forms of social groups can be defined as gangs; this broad definition of "gang" can result in the assumption that gang activity is much more widespread than it really is. On the other hand, a narrow definition could result in a gross miscalculation of the full extent of gang behavior in the United States. Due to the necessity of a clear and fitting definition of a gang, Miller's definition will be adopted for this investigation.

#### **WHY DO SOME YOUTHS JOIN GANGS?**

There has been some research in the area of gangs and much speculation as to what attracts youths to becoming gang members. Fagan (1989) has suggested that the decision to join a gang is a multifaceted process that involves opportunities more than actual recruitment by gangs. These opportunities may be either social, economical, or personal

in nature.

Hochhaus & Sousa (1987) investigated some youths' initial motivation to becoming a gang member. They conducted interviews with nine gang members and found that companionship, protection, and excitement, coupled with peer pressure, were cited as the major reasons for joining a gang. All nine subjects reported discrepancies between what was expected from being in a gang and what was actually gained. During the interview, the subjects reported much dismay over unmet expectations of companionship, protection, and excitement. However, at the time Hochhaus & Sousa's (1987) study was conducted, their subjects had experienced a great deal of adversity in their school, families, and with the law, due to problems revolving around their gang affiliation. As a consequence, these individuals may have viewed their affiliation in the gang more negatively due to the actual outcome derived from their gang membership. On the other hand, gang members who have escaped such adversity may still find the companionship, protection, and excitement that they seek.

An extensive investigation of the profile of gang members was conducted by Friedman, Mann & Friedman (1975). In their study, they obtained psychological, sociological, demographic, and family background information on 536 delinquent youths. The purpose of their study was to

determine distinguishing factors which would identify the typical gang member. The primary factor that they found to differentiate gang-members from non-gang members was a violent disposition. "Street gang members reported substantially more violent behavior than subjects in the study who were not affiliated with gangs" (Friedman, Mann & Friedman, 1975, p. 599). The second factor was the number of expected advantages to be gained from membership in a gang. As expected, gang members highlighted needs such as companionship, protection, excitement, and heterosexual contact (Friedman, Mann & Friedman, 1975).

According to Elliot, Huisings & Menard (1989) and Vigil (1988), another important factor in the decision to join a gang is the influence of parents, siblings, and friends who may have been or still may be gang members. Elliot et al. assert that the closer one is tied to gang members of past or present, the higher the probability of gang membership (1989). Vigil (1988) believes that early and consistent experiences with gang life constitutes a type of preadolescent initiation into the gang.

In summary, for some youths, gang membership facilitates the acquisition and affirmation of a self-identity. The trade-off in making the group one's ego ideal is group protection, alleviation of fears, and a strong sense of emotional bonding or belongingness. In addition,



these individuals are inclined to engage in many deviant group activities in order to act out frustrations, anxieties, and aggressions. For these reasons, the need for companionship, protection, and excitement may be the primary benefits expected and the initial motivation for becoming a gang members.

**COMPANIONSHIP.** The desire for companionship is as natural as it is healthy. In fact, this desire, which begins in childhood and continues through adulthood, often leads individuals to embark on a search for a "kindred-spirit" friend. The need for companionship among adolescents is critical for self and group identity and has been shown to be a major driving force among peers (Erikson, 1980; Elkind, 1980; Thornburg, 1973; Schave & Schave, 1989). As mentioned, the peer group plays a predominant role in adolescents' life. The adolescent is a socially curious being with a perpetual drive for companionship and social interaction, while exhibiting a strong desire for peer approval (Thornburg, 1973, 1982). Other researchers report that friendships become an increasingly important source of companionship during the adolescent period (Youniss, 1980; Caughey, 1980; Burmester & Furman 1987). Vigil (1988), suggested that companionship is of the utmost importance because a gang member's group becomes a replacement where social and familial support have failed.

**PROTECTION.** The protection a gang offers is quite literally a matter of life and death. Whether adolescents' fears are justified or exaggerated, the need to form bonds with others to defend oneself against physical threat from outsiders and other gangs is as natural as it is tragic (Moore, Vigil & Garcia, 1983; Moore, 1991). Moreover, protection by the group confirms acceptance by the group. Individuals vow to pay the supreme price for defending the honor and integrity of the group. And sometimes the supreme price is death.

As the gang member gains a sense of protection, he or she also acquires a feeling of belonging to a group (Riley & Harrell, 1990; Vigil, 1988; Hochhaus & Sousa, 1987). The gang becomes a second "family," providing great camaraderie and companionship (Vigil, 1988). Some gang members are territorial and fight over turf, some are more delinquent, and others just randomly hate. Riley (1991) suggested that gang members appear to be as loyal to their neighborhood as sports fans are to their hometown team. Loyalty is a highly valued asset, with gang members becoming devoted soldiers whose commitment to a cause is often measured in prison terms or spilled blood (Riley & Harrell, 1990).

**EXCITEMENT.** Within the context of a gang, a need for excitement is often synonymous with group members engaging in risky behaviors. Members are able to "act out"

inappropriate behaviors and often engage in delinquent activities either individually or collectively, all for the sake of making a stand for one's name and the gang's reputation. "The fun for such members results not only from venting aggression and a sense of adventure, but also from the emotional support that gang camaraderie provides" (Vigil, 1988, p.427). Additionally, these individuals engage in many obstinate, deviant group activities in order to make known a gang's name.

Another reason why gang members may have a greater need for excitement is because there is generally a poor job market for youths who have few vocational skills, few recreational opportunities, and no resources (National Commission for Employment Policy, 1982). Youths with very limited options often choose to "hang-out" with their friends who share a similar plight, and when they are not going to school or working, opportunities are created for the introduction of other activities and exciting alternatives in order to kill the mundane rituals. However, Agnew & Peterson (1989) found that when peers "hang-out" together, than this type of leisure activity was more positively associated with delinquency than social activities.

**FATALISM.** The concept of fatalism is another factor that is often neglected in gang research, yet may influence

gang membership. Fatalism portrays one's expectations about the future and belief that events are destined, inevitable, and determined by providence. For many young people, fatalism corroborates their preexisting belief that it is their duty to become a gang member. It is the belief that it is inescapable to not join a gang due to present socio-economic conditions which in turn, dictates and causes them to become the target of rival gangs. Gang members and potential future gang member who viewed their life chances negatively would have little reason to defer present gratifications in favor of future rewards. Gang life, therefore, would appeal mostly to those individuals who are confident neither about their adjustment to conventional adolescence nor about their chances as conventional adults. Relatives who also have gang related histories perpetuate the belief that it is one's destiny to join a gang (Elliot, 1989; Vigil, 1988).

The seriousness and ubiquity of the "gang problem" warrants on-going research. There are many young people from these same neighborhoods who resist, and in some cases, escape, joining street gangs - often at the risk of their own physical safety and emotional security; and there has been some speculation as to how they differ from those who join gangs. Additionally, much of what we know about gang behavior and membership has emanated from a "social-

structural" theoretical perspective which has not been empirically tested (Anderson, 1990; Hagedorn 1988; Harris, 1988; Hirschi, 1969; Hochhaus & Sousa, 1987; Jankowski, 1991; Sullivan 1989; Lin Chin, 1990; Taylor, 1990; Vigil, 1988; Williams, 1989). It is therefore, the purpose of this study to empirically identify factors which delineate differences between those with the predilection to gangs and those who stay out of gangs.

It is hoped that the specificity and clarity of the attributes identified as significantly related to street gang membership will aid in the development of more effective preventive and rehabilitative programs to reduce the destructive and antisocial activities of the juvenile street gang. In order to help identify those differences in youths who may be at risk for joining gangs, the following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 1: Those individuals who report a strong desire to be part of a gang or who are gang members will have a greater need for companionship, protection, and excitement than non-gang members.

Hypothesis 2: Those individuals who report a strong desire to be part of a gang or who are gang members will report more family problems and stress than non-gang members.

Hypothesis 3: Those individuals who report a strong desire to be part of a gang or who are gang members will express a

greater belief in fatalism than non-gang members.

It is expected that results will vary by ethnicity on the three hypothesis.

## **METHODS**

### **SUBJECTS**

The subjects in this study were 415 adolescents: 196 males and 219 females. Their ages ranged from 11 to 15 years, with a mean age of 13.03. All of the respondents were either in the seventh grade (270 subjects) or the eighth grade (144 subjects). One hundred eighty-one subjects were Latino (43.6%), 24 were Black (5.8%), 14 were Asian (3.4%), 171 were White (41.2%), and 25 were other (6.0%). All subjects were treated in accordance with the ethical standards of the American Psychological Association.

### **MEASURES**

In addition to demographic information (e.g. age, grade, sex, ethnicity, number of siblings, habitation with parents, birth order, and duration of residence) and two questions relating to being in a gang or desiring to be in a gang, all subjects completed the following instruments:

Gang-Affiliation Questionnaire. This instrument was a modification of the questions originally reported by Hochhaus & Sousa (1987). In their study, questions were answered during an interview; these questions were converted into a 24-item written questionnaire using a five-point

Likert-type format ranging from 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree. The wording of the questions was modified slightly to apply to both gang and non-members. In addition, four questions dealing with fatalism and another question pertaining to gang affiliation were added. Since anonymity was guaranteed to respondents, there was no way to verify individual claims of gang membership against external sources of information.

Network of Relationships Inventory (NRI) (Furman and Buhrmester, 1985). This 18-item scale assesses six qualities of relationships: intimacy, conflict, companionship, affection, satisfaction, and instrumental aid with the individual that the subject spends most of his or her time with. Questions were answered on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from a low of 1 (little or none) to a high of 5 (the most). There were three separate questions for each quality that were then averaged to derive scale scores. Internal consistencies of the scale scores are satisfactory, M Cronbach's Alpha = .80 (Furman and Buhrmester, 1985).

Index of Family Relations (IFR) (Hudson, Acklin, & Bartosh, 1980). The IFR is a 25-item scale that measures the degree or magnitude of problems in family members' relationships as seen by the respondent. Reliability using coefficient alpha was estimated at  $r=.95$ , and discriminant validity coefficient was estimated at 0.92 (Hudson, Acklin,

& Bartosh, 1980).

Junior Sensation Seeking Scale (J-SSS) (Perez, Ortet, Pla' & Simo', 1985). This inventory is a 50-item questionnaire divided into five different subscales (10 items in each). The subscales were: Thrill and Adventure (TAS), Experience Seeking (ES), Disinhibition (Dis), Boredom Susceptibility (BS), and Lie (L) scale. Test-retest reliability was approximately  $r=.76$ , and construct validity coefficient was estimated at 0.80 (Perez, et al., 1985).

#### **PROCEDURE**

The subjects were drawn from a junior high school in a Metropolitan area in Southern California which was known for its problematic gangs. Administrative officials and teachers in these schools were familiarized with the study and were asked to allow their students to participate. With their cooperation, students in particular classes were freed to complete questionnaires during regular class period. Participation of the students was voluntary.

Data collection took place over a four-week period at school. Informed Consent forms were distributed and read to each of the participants. The Informed Consent forms were distributed to parents/guardians and were returned with a parental/guardian signature which gave permission for the minor to participate in the study. Due to the fact that potentially incriminating information was obtained by those



participating, no identifiable information which could possibly link informants to the information, such as signatures, was taken. In this way, the anonymity of the participants was protected.

## **RESULTS**

Subjects were grouped based on their responses to the following two questions: a) are you a gang member? and b) if not, would you like to be a member of a gang? Those individuals who responded "yes" to the first question were categorized as gang members; those who responded "no" to gang membership and "no" to wanting to be in a gang were categorized as non-members; and those individuals who responded "no" to gang membership but answered "yes" or "maybe" to wanting to be in a gang were categorized as "wanna-be's".

Of the 415 students that participated in this study, 63 subjects reported being in a gang, 43 subjects reported that they wanted to be in a gang, and 301 subjects stated that they were not currently in a gang and had no desire to join one. The gang member's group consisted of 44 boys and 19 girls; the "wanna-be" group included 22 boys and 21 girls; and the non-members group consisted of 124 boys and 177 girls.

## **GANG-AFFILIATED FACTORS**

In order to reduce the number of items investigated,

the 29 possible motivational items for gang membership were factor analyzed using a principal-components analysis with an orthogonal rotation for simple factor loadings. Factors with eigenvalues greater than one were retained. Seven factors were extracted and accounted for 59.6% of the variance. These results are shown in Table 1.

---

Insert Table 1 here.

---

After examining the items that loaded in each factor, they were labeled as follows: Factor 1-Fatalistic Expectations, Factor 2-Companionship/Protection; Factor 3-Friend Reasons; Factor 4-Thrill-Seeking; Factor 5-Extra-curricular Activities; Factor 6-Relational Preference, and Factor 7-Feel Bad.

These seven factor scores rather than the 29 possible motivational items, were used as dependent variables in the analyses. All the items that fell within a given factor and had a loading greater than 0.5 were summed in order to obtain each subject's total score on the factor. Items with factor loadings less than 0.5 were not used in computing factor scores. Higher scores on the items meant that the subject assigned greater importance to that factor.

A MANOVA was performed in order to determine if gang members and "wanna-be's" scored significantly different than

non-members on the seven factors described above. This analysis yielded a significant (Hotelling's  $T^2 = 2.695$ ,  $F(14,770) = 74.124$ ,  $p < .0001$ ). Follow-up ANOVA's are presented in Table 2.

---

Insert Table 2 here.

---

As can be seen in Table 2, there were significant differences on all factors. Post-hoc Tukey's-HSD at  $p < .05$  revealed that gang members and "wanna-be's" scored significantly higher than non-gang members on the following factors: Friend Reasons and Relational Preference. Non-members scored significantly higher than gang members on Extra-curricular Activities and "wanna-be's" scored significantly higher than non-members on the Feel Bad factor.

It had been hypothesized that gang members and "wanna-be" gang members would score higher than non-members on the need for companionship and protection. As can be seen in the ANOVA for Factor 2, the Companionship/Protection factor that consisted of six items representing the need for companionship and protection among peers was significant. Post-hoc tests indicated that gang members and "wanna-be's" indeed scored significantly higher than non-members on this Companionship/Protection factor.

It was also hypothesized that gang members and "wanna-be's" would score higher than non-members on the need for excitement. Factor 4, the Thrill-Seeking factor, was composed of two items that represented the need for excitement among peers. The ANOVA for this factor was significant, and post-hoc Tukey's-HSD test at  $(\alpha)=.05$  confirmed that gang members and "wanna-be's" scored significantly higher than non-members on this Thrill-Seeking factor  $F(2,403) = 60.48, p<.001$ .

#### **FATALISTIC EXPECTATION**

It had also been hypothesized that gang members and "wanna-be" gang members would have higher fatalism scores than non-members. Factor 1, the Fatalistic Expectation factor, was composed of six items that were representative of a commonly shared belief indicative of fatalism. As can be seen, the ANOVA was significant. Post-hoc Tukey's-HSD test at the  $(\alpha)=.05$  level indicated that gang members and "wanna-be's" had a significantly higher fatalism score than non-members.

The importance of companionship was also assessed via scores on the Network of Relationship's Inventory (NRI). Scores on the eight subscales were evaluated by a MANOVA across gang membership, which was significant (Hotelling's  $T^2 = .3601, F(8,391) = 17.601, p<.001$ ). Follow-up ANOVA's are presented in Table 3.

---

Insert Table 3 here.

---

Post-hoc Tukey's-HSD tests at  $(\alpha)=.05$  revealed that gang members and "wanna-be's" scored higher than non-members on all factors. Thus, higher scores on the subscale meant that the subject reported a greater amount of that quality.

Thrill-Seeking was also evaluated using the Junior Sensation-Seeking Scale (J-SSS). Differences among the three groups on the five subscales measuring the need for excitement and thrill-seeking were assessed using a MANOVA, which was significant (Hotelling's  $T^2 = .436$ ,  $F(1,397) = 34.295$ ,  $p<.001$ ). Follow-up ANOVA's are presented in Table 4.

---

Insert Table 4 here.

---

Post-hoc Tukey's-HSD tests at  $(\alpha)=.05$  indicated that gang members and "wanna-be" gang members scored significantly higher than non-members on the Experience Seeking (ES), Disinhibition (DIS), Boredom Susceptibility (BS), and Lie (LIE) scale. Contrary to what was expected, gang members did not score significantly higher than non-members on the Thrill & Adventure (TAS) Scale.

Additional MANOVA's were performed in order to examine

for possible gender and ethnic differences on the factors from the J-SSS questionnaire. The result for gender differences was significant (Hotelling's  $T^2 = .156$ ,  $F(7,395) = 8.834$ ,  $p < .0001$ ). Follow-up ANOVA's are presented in Table 5.

---

Insert Table 5 here.

---

As can be seen, boys scored significantly higher than girls on Fatalistic Expectations, Thrill-Seeking, and the Feel Bad factors. A MANOVA for ethnic differences was also significant (Hotelling's  $T^2 = .196$ ,  $F(21,1,103) = 3.439$ ,  $p < .0001$ ). Follow-up analyses are presented in Table 6.

---

Insert Table 6 here.

---

Post-hoc results indicate that Latinos and Blacks scored significantly higher than Whites on the Fatalistic Expectations factor; Latinos and Whites scored significantly higher than Asians on the Thrill Seeking factor; and Latinos scored significantly higher than Whites on the Feel Bad factor.

#### **FAMILY PROBLEMS**

In order to test the hypothesis that gang members and "wanna-be's" would have more family problems than non-

members, a one-way ANOVA was performed on the Index of Family Relations (IFR) questionnaire. This was significant ( $F(2,393) = 98.32, p < .0001$ ). A post-hoc analysis using Tukey's HSD with a significance level at .05 indicated that gang members ( $M=68.70$  and  $SD=19.86$ ) and "wanna-be's" ( $M=64.50$  and  $SD=18.92$ ) scored significantly higher than non-members ( $M=38.06$  and  $SD=17.77$ ).

A one-way ANOVA was performed to test for ethnic differences. Results indicated that there were significant differences among ethnic groups ( $F(3,362) = 6.644, p < .0002$ ). Post-hoc test using Tukey's-HSD with significance level at .05 indicated that Latinos ( $M=48.95, SD=21.78$ ) scored significantly higher than Asians ( $M=30.19, SD=14.09$ ), and that African-Americans ( $M=59.15, SD=28.61$ ) scored significantly higher than both whites ( $M=43.06, SD=22.02$ ) and Asians.

A Pearson Chi Square ( $\chi^2=136.40$ ) on family members X gang membership yielded an interesting finding that is important to mention. In this study, 46 of the 63 subjects from the gang member group reported that a family member was either currently a gang member or had previously been one. Twenty-four of the 43 subjects who reported wanting to be in a gang and 30 of the 301 subjects from the non-member group admitted to having family members who were either past or present gang members.

## DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate possible differences and similarities among gang members, "wanna-be" gang members and non-gang members. Present results using a Southern California sample have generally supported the socio-psychological hypotheses. Gang members and "wanna-be" gang members were found to desire more companionship from peers, have a greater need for protection, and seek more excitement than subjects in the study who were not affiliated with gangs. Gang members and "wanna-be's" also expressed a greater belief in fatalistic expectations and reported a higher degree of family problems than non-members. These findings are consistent with those of previous studies comparing the characteristics of gang members (Elliot et al., 1989; Friedman, Mann & Friedman, 1975; Hochhaus & Sousa, 1987; Riley & Harrell, 1990; Vigil, 1988; and Zuckerman and Link, 1968).

The hypothesized relationship between companionship, protection, and excitement was supported among both gang members and "wanna-be" gang members. The present study replicated the previous finding that often, these qualities were the primary reasons cited for initially joining a gang (Hochhaus & Sousa, 1987) and as the expected advantages to be gained by joining a gang (Friedman, Mann & Friedman, 1975).



Results of this study are consistent with Vigil's (1988) findings. He reported that gang members and "wanna-be" gang members would have a greater need for companionship and protection than non-gang affiliated individuals because the gang becomes a replacement when social and familial support have failed for the individual (Vigil, 1988). By committing one's self to a gang and by complying with the gang's code of conduct, the group often provides the individual with opportunity for personal, as well as social identity. The results of this study are also in accordance with that of Riley and Harrell (1990), who suggested that in return for one's commitment, a gang member's companions will provide acceptance, personal security, social support, bonding, and street survival skills which can often mean the difference between living and dying on the streets.

In this study, gang members and "wanna-be's" had a greater need for excitement than non-members. These results are in accordance with what other researchers have found. Vigil (1988) suggested that, in conjunction with companionship and protection, a gang often provides a rousing sense of adventure and an "appropriate" (according to gang standards) manner to vent frustrations and aggression. Zuckerman and Link (1968) found that individuals with high sensation-seeking scores tended to be more impulsive, more anti-social, and non-conformists.

Farley (1973) postulated that high sensation-seekers were more likely to engage in delinquent behaviors because they "needed higher levels of stimulation and came from environments with very limited opportunities in order to satisfy stimulus-seeking needs in a socially approved manner" (White, Labouvie, & Bates, 1985, pg.198). While the present study was not designed to test competing theories of delinquency, its findings lend support to the notion that individuals who have a greater need for excitement and are high thrill-seekers tend to be more delinquent and less concerned with adherence to social norms (Hindelang, 1972).

In this study, it is uncertain if family problems prompted an adolescent to join a gang or resulted from the youth being in a gang. However, it is very clear that the gang members and "wanna be's" reported more family problems and stress than their counterpart peers who were not involved with gang membership. Present findings were consistent with Vigil's (1988) observations of the relationship between family problems and self-reported gang membership among adolescents. Vigil stated that "gang members generally share a background of family stress and an opposition toward many traditional pursuits of childhood and adolescence" (1988, pg.87). It has been suggested by other researchers that "poor family relationships predispose youths to gang affiliation and delinquency because there is

less parental control which in turn, allows for an increased influence of the gang on the youth" (Friedman, Mann & Friedman 1975, pg. 601). As a result, the gang takes on many of the family roles and becomes a socializing unit that fills a void left by families under stress.

The current study supported the predicted relationship of fatalistic expectations among gang, "wanna-be" and non-gang members. Fatalism was shown to be a very important distinguishing factor between the groups. Results indicated that gang members and "wanna-be's" consistently scored higher than non-members on the belief in fatalism. Stinchcombe (1964), postulated that individuals who held negative expectations about their life would have little reason to delay present gratifications in favor of future rewards. Therefore, some individuals would join a gang because they have no good reason not to. This position also supports Cohen's (1955) analysis that individuals who experience negative reactions from the adult world eventually come to depend on one another as sources of positive support. Hence, gang life would appeal mostly to those individuals with very little certainty about their chances as competent adults. Believing in the chance of becoming a successful adult empowers an individual to resist joining a gang.

The present study has demonstrated that the interview

questions used by Hochhaus and Sousa (1987) in their investigation of gang membership can be administered in written format to both gang and non-gang affiliated individuals. These questions were also able to be organized in an orderly fashion. From these questions, a consistent pattern emerged between gang, "wanna-be", and non-gang members. Data indicated that gang members and "wanna-be's" have consistently scored higher than non-gang members on almost all factors that were investigated.

An exception to this pattern occurred when non-gang members reported being involved in more extra-curricular activities than gang members and "wanna-be's". These results suggest that participation in extra-curricular activities may serve as a buffer or protection from youths joining a gang. Additionally, more "wanna-be's" than non-members reported feeling bad about the group of friends they chose to hang around with. It could be that "wanna-be's" are dissatisfied with their current, non-gang friends and that is prompting them to want to join a gang. On the other hand, gang members did not report having bad feelings about their peers. Therefore, it is suggested that "wanna-be's" may be experiencing doubt and indecision about solidifying their loyalty to the group.

While this study has produced interesting and valuable data, the results are limited. A limitation with self-

reporting gang status is that the item content of the questionnaire is apparent and subjects can therefore, make themselves be as gang or non-gang related as they wish. Another limitation with self-reporting gang status exists due to the difficulty of checking these reports against external sources. However, it is our belief and expectation that youths' will act in accordance to how they feel and desire to be perceived by others. Therefore, if they feel like a gang member and desire to be in a gang with their peers, then their actions will follow accordingly. The same holds true for gang and non-gang members. Additionally, another limitation is that the sample size does not equally represent different ethnic and gender groups. This study did not have enough girls participating or a balanced number of subjects in each ethnic group.

Although results indicated that gang members, "wanna-be's" and non-gang members have different levels of needs on a variety of socio-psychological factors, a different level of analysis would be required to explain why some individuals become affiliated with gangs while others do not. It is unclear from this investigation if these differences initially prompted a youth to join a gang or resulted from the individual being in a gang. Since "wanna-be's" consistently scored between that of gang and non-gang members, results suggest that these factors may be causally

related. Longitudinal studies may prove to be beneficial in future studies on gang membership. Additionally, future research investigating familial factors, such as socio-economic status, divorce, and child abuse are suggested areas of concern for subsequent studies. Also, replicating this study in different regions may produce distinctive results.

In essence, the opportunity for gang involvement seemed to be provided by the external social environment, and the personal decision to join appeared to be governed by social attachments and by self-identity. Although application of interventions are beyond the scope of this study, perhaps future interventions for gang deterrent should be directed at schools and family in helping the youth form attachments with both institutions and gaining a sense of identity through more positive role-models.

**Table I. ROTATED SORTED FACTORS: GANG-AFFILIATED FACTORS**

<b>I. FATALISTIC EXPECTATION, 30.0% of variance</b>	
Retaliation as payback	.839
Bad things happen more	.814
My duty as a member	.767
Get a tatoo	.753
Do illegal things	.656
Advantages of a gang	.576
<b>II. COMPANIONSHIP/PROTECTION, 8.4% of variance</b>	
Companionship	.703
Close friends	.693
Get together	.651
Protection	.636
Like friends	.592
Loyal to friends	.522
<b>III. FRIEND REASONS, 5.2% of variance</b>	
Friends help with family problems	.730
Look for exciting things to do	.660
Been with friends for a long time	.589
Relatives group of friends	.503
<b>IV. THRILL-SEEKING, 4.4% of variance</b>	
Do exciting things	.786
Get our kicks	.758
<b>V. EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES, 4.2% of variance</b>	
Do after-school activities	-.697
<b>VI. RELATIONAL PREFERENCE, 4.0% of variance</b>	
Same race of friends	.764
Quit hanging around	.609
<b>VII. FEEL BAD, 3.5% of variance</b>	
Feel bad about these friends	.750

**Table II. MANOVA AND ANOVA OF GANG MEMBERS, "WANNA-BE'S" AND NON-MEMBERS ON GANG-AFFILIATED FACTORS: HOTELLING'S  $T^2$  = .774,  $F(7,391)=43.288$**

FACTOR	Gang member N=63 Mean	Wanna-Be N=43 Mean	Non-Member N=348 Mean	SS	F	p
1. Fatalistic Belief	28.73	26.81	11.94	19959.52	489.9	.001
2. Companion-ship/Protection	26.84	26.25	22.51	1307.15	45.5	.001
3. Friend Reasons	16.65	15.27	12.28	1176.27	47.1	.001
4. Thrill-Seeking	8.66	7.97	5.61	606.12	59.4	.001
5. Extra-Curricular Activities	1.87	2.53	2.89	55.77	12.4	.001
6. Relational Preference	7.87	7.23	6.34	135.01	13.1	.001
7. Feel Bad	2.12	2.51	1.95	12.12	3.8	.022

df=(2,392) for each F above.



**Table III. MANOVA AND ANOVA OF GANG MEMBERS, "WANNA-BE'S AND NON-MEMBERS ON THE NETWORK OF RELATIONSHIPS INVENTORY: HOTELLING'S  $T^2 = .360$ ,  $F(8,391) = 17.600$**

FACTOR	Gang-Member Mean	Wanna-be Mean	Non-Member Mean	SS	F	p
Intimacy	13.01	11.67	10.42	203.860	28.19	.001
Conflict	10.71	8.65	6.63	883.233	97.94	.001
Companion- ship	12.19	11.32	10.23	169.967	18.43	.001
Satisfaction	12.88	11.90	11.09	707.542	68.43	.001
Antagonism	10.74	9.02	7.01	357.289	32.55	.001
Nurturing	13.23	11.67	10.61	366.244	44.63	.001
Admiration	12.93	11.58	10.80	240.668	29.78	.001
Reliability	13.23	11.83	10.95	274.987	29.36	.001

df=(1.398) for each F above.

**Table IV. MANOVA AND ANOVA OF GANG MEMBERS, WANNA-BE'S AND NON-MEMBERS ON THE JUNIOR SENSATION-SEEKING SCALE:  
HOTELLING'S  $T^2$  = .436,  $F(5,393)$  = 34.295**

FACTOR	Gang-Member Mean	Wanna-Be Mean	Non-Member Mean	SS	F	p
Thrill & Adventure Seeking (TAS)	4.571	5.604	4.735	1.421	.203	.652
Experience Seeking (ES)	6.222	5.976	4.467	163.396	52.290	.001
Disinhibition (DIS)	6.793	6.395	4.071	393.146	120.561	.001
Boredom Susceptibility (BS)	6.222	5.976	4.056	248.824	52.243	.001
Lie (LIE)	8.380	8.279	5.955	312.135	62.170	.001
df=(1,397) for each F above.						

**Table V. MANOVA AND ANOVA OF GENDER DIFFERENCES ON GANG-AFFILIATED FACTORS: HOTELLING'S  $T^2 = .156$ ,  $F(7,395) = 8.834$**

FACTOR	Male N=44 Mean	Female N=19 Mean	SS	F	p
1. Fatalistic Belief	18.401	14.431	1584.191	23.547	.001
2. Companionship /Protection	23.864	23.417	20.132	1.150	.284
3. Friend Reasons	13.354	13.279	.558	.035	.850
4. Thrill-Seeking	7.171	7.701	217.360	35.787	.001
5. Extra- Curricular Activities	2.760	2.639	1.462	.609	.435
6. Relational Preference	6.875	6.573	9.140	1.677	.196
7. Feel Bad	2.265	1.862	16.331	10.257	.001

df=(1,401) for each F above.

**Table VI. MANOVA AND ANOVA OF ETHNIC DIFFERENCES ON GANG-AFFILIATED FACTORS: HOTELLING'S  $T^2 = .19646$ ,  $F(21,1103) = 3.439$**

FACTOR	Latino N=179 Mean	Black N=24 Mean	Asian N=14 Mean	White N=170 Mean	Ss	F	p
Fatalistic Belief	18.36	20.08	13.69	14.12	1964.84	9.62	.001
Companionship /Protect- ion	23.78	24.70	22.53	23.45	52.88	1.00	.393
Friend Reasons	13.40	13.45	10.92	13.30	76.03	1.64	.178
Thrill- Seeking	6.64	6.37	4.61	6.46	50.42	2.63	.050
Extra-Curricular Activities	2.53	2.20	2.76	2.91	18.07	2.51	.058
Relational Preference	7.08	7.25	6.00	6.51	40.65	2.58	.053
Feel Bad	2.27	2.20	2.38	1.80	20.85	4.38	.005

df=(21,1103) for each F above.

APPENDIX A

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING:

1. How old are you? \_\_\_\_
2. Sex: \_\_\_\_ male \_\_\_\_ female
3. What grade are you in?  
\_\_\_\_ 7th grade \_\_\_\_ 8th grade \_\_\_\_ 9th grade
4. What is your ethnicity?  
\_\_\_\_ Latino \_\_\_\_ Black \_\_\_\_ Asian  
\_\_\_\_ White \_\_\_\_ Other
5. How many years have you lived where you are now? \_\_\_\_ years
6. I live mostly with ...  
\_\_\_\_ mother \_\_\_\_ father \_\_\_\_ both mother and father  
\_\_\_\_ mother and at least one other adult relative  
\_\_\_\_ father and at least one other adult relative  
\_\_\_\_ grandmother or other relative  
\_\_\_\_ a person who is not a relative
7. How many brothers (including step) do you have? \_\_\_\_  
How many sisters (including step) do you have? \_\_\_\_
8. I am the ...  
\_\_\_\_ oldest child in the family  
\_\_\_\_ middle child in the family  
\_\_\_\_ youngest child in the family
9. Are you a member of a gang? \_\_\_\_  
If not, would you like to be a member of a gang? \_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX B

Answer each item as carefully and accurately as you can by circling a number:

- 1 STRONGLY DISAGREE
- 2 DISAGREE
- 3 NEUTRAL
- 4 AGREE
- 5 STRONGLY AGREE

1. I have a good relationship with my parents  
1 2 3 4 5
2. I have a group of close friends  
1 2 3 4 5
3. I get together often with my close friends  
1 2 3 4 5
4. My group of friends provide me with companionship  
1 2 3 4 5
5. My group of friends provide me with protection  
1 2 3 4 5
6. I like being with my group of friends  
1 2 3 4 5
7. I am loyal to this group of friends  
1 2 3 4 5
8. My friends and I have a group name that we are known by  
1 2 3 4 5
9. I could quit hanging around these friends whenever I want  
1 2 3 4 5
10. My friends and I look for exciting things to do when we get together  
1 2 3 4 5
11. My friends help me with family and/or school related problems  
1 2 3 4 5
12. My friends and I have a turf that we call our own  
1 2 3 4 5
13. I sometimes feel bad about having this group of friends  
1 2 3 4 5
14. There was an initiation into this group of friends  
1 2 3 4 5
15. The group of friends that I hang out with most often are of the same ethnic group as me  
1 2 3 4 5
16. I have been with this group of friends for a long time  
1 2 3 4 5
17. Some of my relatives have been involved with the same or similar group of friends  
1 2 3 4 5

- 1 STRONGLY DISAGREE
- 2 DISAGREE
- 3 NEUTRAL
- 4 AGREE
- 5 STRONGLY AGREE

18. There are a lot of members (25 or more) in my group of friends  
1      2      3      4      5
19. I am active in after school activities such as sports, band, cheer-leading, etc.  
1      2      3      4      5
20. There is sometimes peer pressure to do things within the group  
1      2      3      4      5
21. When me and my friends get together, we sometimes do illegal things  
1      2      3      4      5
22. I would get a tattoo of my neighborhood or group symbol  
1      2      3      4      5
23. When I grow up I will live in the same or similar neighborhood as I do now, for the rest of my life  
1      2      3      4      5
24. I may be shot or stabbed by another group of people because of a retaliation or vendetta as payback  
1      2      3      4      5
25. Bad things happen more to me and my friends than other groups of people  
1      2      3      4      5
26. It is my duty as a group member to live and die for my friends  
1      2      3      4      5
27. I am a member of a gang  
1      2      3      4      5
28. I like doing things for "kicks"  
1      2      3      4      5
29. I like doing things that are exciting even if its dangerous  
1      2      3      4      5
30. There are advantages to someone being in a gang  
1      2      3      4      5

If you agree, then what are some of those advantages

---



---

31. How many times in the last 2 months have you worn gang colors at school? \_\_\_\_\_ times
32. How many times in the last 2 months have you flashed gang signs at school? \_\_\_\_\_ times
33. In the neighborhood in the last 2 months, did anyone attack, threaten, or hurt you?  
\_\_\_\_\_ yes \_\_\_\_\_ no
34. In and around school, in the last 2 months, did you threaten or hurt someone in anyway?  
\_\_\_\_\_ yes \_\_\_\_\_ no
35. If the answer was "yes" to the above question, than was it gang related?  
\_\_\_\_\_ yes \_\_\_\_\_ no
36. Has anybody in your family ever been in a gang before?  
\_\_\_\_\_ yes \_\_\_\_\_ no
37. If you answered "yes" to the above question, then how was this person(s) related to you?  
\_\_\_\_\_
38. If you are a gang member than please identify your street gang by name \_\_\_\_\_ and location \_\_\_\_\_.



## APPENDIX C

\*\*\* Please circle either true or false:

1. I like a lot of risky sports  
TRUE FALSE
2. I often wish I could be a mountain climber  
TRUE FALSE
3. I would like to go scuba diving  
TRUE FALSE
4. I would like to try parachute jumping  
TRUE FALSE
5. I like to dive off the high-board  
TRUE FALSE
6. I would like to take up the sport of water-skiing  
TRUE FALSE
7. I would dare to fly with a 'Delta' wing (hang-gliding)  
TRUE FALSE
8. I would pilot an airplane  
TRUE FALSE
9. I would sail a long distance in a small but seaworthy sailing craft  
TRUE FALSE
10. I would ski very fast down a high mountain slope  
TRUE FALSE
11. I would like to explore a strange city or section of town myself, even if it means getting lost  
TRUE FALSE
12. I would like to take off on a trip with no preplanned or definite routes or timetables  
TRUE FALSE
13. I would like to make friends in some 'far-out' groups  
TRUE FALSE
14. People should dress in individual ways even if the effects are sometimes strange  
TRUE FALSE
15. I like to be different, even if it annoys other people  
TRUE FALSE
16. I like to dissect animals and do experiments with them  
TRUE FALSE

17. I would dare to sleep in the street or in a public garden  
**TRUE FALSE**
18. I would dare to swim in a public pool or fountain  
**TRUE FALSE**
19. I like wild parties  
**TRUE FALSE**
20. I like to have new and exciting experiences and sensations  
**TRUE FALSE**
21. I would swim at the beach  
**TRUE FALSE**
22. I would like to live in a country without bans of any kind  
**TRUE FALSE**
23. I get bored seeing the same old faces  
**TRUE FALSE**
24. I can't stand being in the same place for a while  
**TRUE FALSE**
25. I can't go a long time without doing anything new  
**TRUE FALSE**
26. I do not like people who always do the same thing  
**TRUE FALSE**
27. I get bored if I have to watch a movie that I have seen before  
**TRUE FALSE**
28. I do not like to go out with people of whom I know in advance what they will do or say  
**TRUE FALSE**
29. I usually don't enjoy a movie or a play where I can predict what will happen in advance  
**TRUE FALSE**
30. I have no patience with dull or boring persons  
**TRUE FALSE**
31. I do not like to go to the same place regularly  
**TRUE FALSE**
32. I do not like to always play the same games  
**TRUE FALSE**
33. Sometimes I have been greedy by helping myself to more than my share of anything

- |   | TRUE | FALSE |
|---|------|-------|
| 34. I have not always observed all the rules at school                    | TRUE | FALSE |
| 35. I have taken things that belonged to someone else                     | TRUE | FALSE |
| 36. Sometimes I've pretended not to hear when someone was calling me      | TRUE | FALSE |
| 37. Sometimes I talk when older people are talking                        | TRUE | FALSE |
| 38. I have said bad things about someone before                           | TRUE | FALSE |
| 39. I am not always quiet in class  | TRUE | FALSE |
| 40. Sometimes I've eaten more sweets than the amount I was allowed to     | TRUE | FALSE |
| 41. Sometimes I have wanted to play truant from school                    | TRUE | FALSE |
| 42. Sometimes I cheat in games  | TRUE | FALSE |
| 43. I have done some things that are considered illegal.                  | TRUE | FALSE |
| 44. I like to do risky things   | TRUE | FALSE |
| 45. I am faithful to my girlfriend or boyfriend                           | TRUE | FALSE |
| 46. I like to get "loosened" up   | TRUE | FALSE |
| 47. I like to do things that are bad for me                               | TRUE | FALSE |
| 48. I like to have more than one girlfriend or boyfriend at the same time | TRUE | FALSE |

## APPENDIX D

The next questions ask about your friendship with the person you hang out with the most:

First name of person \_\_\_\_\_  
Sex of person \_\_\_\_\_ Relationship \_\_\_\_\_

Answer each item as carefully and accurately as you can by circling a number:

- 1 LITTLE OR NONE
- 2 SOMEWHAT
- 3 VERY MUCH
- 4 EXTREMELY MUCH
- 5 THE MOST

1. How much time do you spend with this person?  
1      2      3      4      5
2. How much do you and this person get upset with or mad at each other?  
1      2      3      4      5
3. How satisfied are you with your relationship with this person?  
1      2      3      4      5
4. How much do you and this person get on each other's nerves?  
1      2      3      4      5
5. How much do you tell this person everything?  
1      2      3      4      5
6. How much do you help this person with things he/she can't do by him/herself?  
1      2      3      4      5
7. How much does this person treat you like you're admired and respected?  
1      2      3      4      5
8. How sure are you that this relationship will last no matter what?  
1      2      3      4      5
9. How much do you play around and have fun with this person?  
1      2      3      4      5
10. How much do you quarrel/disagree with this person?  
1      2      3      4      5
11. How happy are you with the way things are between you and this person?  
1      2      3      4      5
12. How much do you and this person get annoyed with each other's behavior?  
1      2      3      4      5
13. How much do you share your secrets and private feelings with this person?  
1      2      3      4      5

- 1 LITTLE OR NONE
- 2 SOMEWHAT
- 3 VERY MUCH
- 4 EXTREMELY MUCH
- 5 THE MOST

14. How much do you protect or look out for this person?  
1      2      3      4      5
15. How much does this person treat you like you're good at many things?  
1      2      3      4      5
16. How sure are you that your relationship will last in spite of fights?  
1      2      3      4      5
17. How often do you go places and do enjoyable things with this person?  
1      2      3      4      5
18. How much do you argue with this person?  
1      2      3      4      5
19. How good is your relationship with this person?  
1      2      3      4      5
20. How much do you and this person hassle or nag one another?  
1      2      3      4      5
21. How much do you talk to this person about things that you don't want others to know?  
1      2      3      4      5
22. How much do you take care of this person?  
1      2      3      4      5
23. How much does this person like or approve of the things you do?  
1      2      3      4      5
24. How sure are you that your relationship will continue in the years to come?  
1      2      3      4      5

## APPENDIX E

Answer each item as carefully and accurately as you can by circling a number

- 1 Rarely or none of the time
- 2 A little of the time
- 3 Some of the time
- 4 A good part of the time
- 5 Most or all of the time

1. The members of my family really care about each other  
1      2      3      4      5
2. I think my family is terrific  
1      2      3      4      5
3. My family gets on my nerves  
1      2      3      4      5
4. I really enjoy my family  
1      2      3      4      5
5. I can really depend on my family  
1      2      3      4      5
6. I really do not care to be around my family  
1      2      3      4      5
7. I wish I was not part of this family  
1      2      3      4      5
8. I get along well with my family  
1      2      3      4      5
9. Members of my family argue too much  
1      2      3      4      5
10. There is no sense of closeness in my family  
1      2      3      4      5
11. I feel like a stranger in my family  
1      2      3      4      5
12. My family does not understand me  
1      2      3      4      5
13. There is too much hatred in my family  
1      2      3      4      5

- 1 Rarely or none of the time
- 2 A little of the time
- 3 Some of the time
- 4 A good part of the time
- 5 Most or all of the time

14. Members of my family are really good to one another

1 2 3 4 5

15. My family is well respected by those who know us

1 2 3 4 5

16. There seems to be a lot of friction in my family

1 2 3 4 5

17. There is a lot of love in my family

1 2 3 4 5

18. Members of my family get along well together

1 2 3 4 5

19. Life in my family is generally unpleasant

1 2 3 4 5

20. My family is a great joy to me

1 2 3 4 5

21. I feel proud of my family

1 2 3 4 5

22. Other families seem to get along better than ours

1 2 3 4 5

23. My family is a real source of comfort to me

1 2 3 4 5

24. I feel left out of my family

1 2 3 4 5

25. My family is an unhappy one

1 2 3 4 5

## APPENDIX F

### INFORMED CONSENT

#### DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

The following is a survey about you, your family, and the friends that you hang out with the most. The questions on the other pages ask you to describe your relationship with your friends and your family. We are doing this survey because friends and family may be important to you and may influence you in different ways. If this is so, then we want to hear what you think about them.

It will take about 15 minutes to finish answering the questions. You are encouraged to fill out the survey only if you want to - you do not have to. Also, if you want to stop answering the questions at anytime, than that is okay, too.

This survey is totally confidential - nobody will ever be able to trace your survey back to you or know your answers. If you choose to participate than please sign your name at the bottom of this page and tear this page off from the rest and give it to your teacher.

When you are done, then please give the survey back to your teacher. If you have any comments or questions about this study, than feel free to contact Dr. Elizabeth Klonoff at (909) 880-5584.

Thank you, very much!

-----  
I choose to volunteer for this study.

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_



## APPENDIX G

### DEBRIEFING STATEMENT

#### DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

This debriefing statement is to inform all volunteers who participated in the study of friendship and family relationships that the investigation has been concluded.

As volunteers, you were told that the focus of this study was to examine the relationship with both your friends and family members. We were particularly interested in factors such as companionship, protection, excitement, the extent of problems that you have at home with your family and the belief in fatalism (which means that something is unavoidable and is going to happen). We were investigating how these factors may influence whether or not you are already in a gang or if you desired to be in a gang.

Results of this study will be available in approximately two months. You are encouraged to contact Dr. Elizabeth Klonoff at (909) 880-5584 if you are interested in obtaining the results of this study. Also, any comments or reactions about this study are welcomed and are considered extremely beneficial to future research. Therefore, please do not hesitate to call.

Thank you very much for your participation!

## REFERENCES

- AGNEW, R. & PETERSON, M. (1989). The relationship between leisure and delinquency. Social Problems 36(4):332-350.
- ANDERSON, E. 1990. Street Wise. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- BERNDT, T.J. (1981). Relations between social cognition, non-social cognition, and social behavior. In J.H. Flavell & L.D. Ross (Eds.), social cognitive development (pp. 176-199). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- BROWN, S., ALPERT, D., LENT, R.W., HUNT, G. & BRADY, T. (1988). Perceived social support among college students: factor structure of the social support inventory. Journal of Counseling Psychology 35(3): 472-478.
- BROWNFELD, D. & THOMPSON, K. (1991). Attachment to peers and delinquent behavior. Canadian Journal of Criminology, Jan.
- BUHRMESTER, D. & FURMAN, W. (1987). The development of companionship and intimacy. Child Development (58), 1101-1113.
- BYNUM, J.E. & W.E. THOMPSON. 1988. Juvenile Delinquency: A Sociological Approach. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- California Council on Criminal Justice: State Task Force on Gangs and Drugs. Final Report, January, 1989.
- California Council on Criminal Justice: State Task Force on Youth Gang Violence. Final Report, January, 1986.
- CAMPBELL, A. & S. MUNCER. (1989). Them and us: A comparison of the cultural context of American gangs and British subcultures. Deviant Behavior 10: 271-288.
- CAUGHEY, J.L. (1980). Personal identity and social organization. Ethos 8(3):173-203.
- CHIN, KO-LIN 1990. Chinese Subculture and Criminality: Non-traditional Crime Groups in America. New York: Greenwood Press.
- CLOWARD, R.A. & OHLIN, L.B. (1960). Delinquency and opportunity: A Theory of Delinquent Gangs. New York: Free Press.

- COHEN, A.K. 1955. Delinquent boys: The culture of the gangs. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- CONDY, J. & SIMAN, M. (1974). Characteristics of peer and adult-oriented children. Journal of Marriage and the Family 36(3) 543-554.
- DUNPHY, D. (1975). The social structure of urban adolescent peer groups. Sociometry (1963), 26, 230-246. Reprinted in R. Grinder (Ed.), Studies in Adolescence (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan
- ELKIND, D. (1978). Understanding the young adolescent. Child Development, (38) 1025-1034.
- ELKIND, D. (1980). Strategic interaction in early adolescence. in J. Adelson (3d.), Handbook of Adolescent Psychology. New York: Wiley.
- ELLIOT, D.S., D. HUISINGS, and S. MENARD, 1989. Multiple Problem Youth: Delinquency, Substance Use, and Mental Health Problems. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- ERIKSON, ERIK H. (1980). Ego identity and the Psychosocial Moratorium. New Perspectives for Research on Juvenile Delinquency. (H.L. Witmer & R. Kotinsky, (eds.)), pp. 1-23. U.S. Children's Bureau: Publication no. 356.
- ERIKSON, ERIK H. (1968). Psychosocial identity. In International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, ed. D. Sills, 7:61-65. New York: Macmillan and the Free Press.
- FAGAN, J. 1989. The social organization of drug use and drug dealing among urban gangs. Criminology 24: 439-471.
- FARLEY, F.H. 1973. "A theory of delinquency." Presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Montreal.
- FRIEDMAN, C., MANN, F. & FRIEDMAN, A. (1975). A profile of juvenile street gang members. Adolescence 10(40): 563-607.
- GIORDANO, P.C., CERNKOVICH, S.A. & PUGH, M.D. (1986). Friendship and delinquency. American Journal of Sociology 91(5): 1170-1202.
- HAGEDORN, JOHN M. 1988. People and Folks: Gangs, Crime and the Underclass in a Rust Belt City. Chicago: Lakeview.

- HARRIS, MARY G. 1988. Cholas: Latin Girls and Gangs. New York: AMS Press.
- HINDELANG, M.J. (1972). The relationship of self-reported delinquency to scales of the CPI and MMPI. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science 63(1), 75-81.
- HIRSCHI, T. (1969). Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- HOCHHAUS, C. & SOUSA, F. (1987). Why children belong to gangs: A comparison of expectations and reality. The High School Journal, Dec./Jan. 1988.
- HOLLINGSHEAD, A. (1975). Elmtowns youth and Elmtown revisited. New York: Wiley (original published in 1949).
- HUDSON, W.W., ACKLIN, J.D. & BARTOSH, J.C. (1980). Assessing discord in family relationships. Social Work Research & Abstracts (16) 21-29.
- JANKOWSKI, MARTIN S. 1991. Islands in the Street: Gangs and American Urban Society. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- KAROLY, P. (1975). Comparison of psychological styles in delinquent and non-delinquent females. Psychology Reports 36: 567-570.
- LALLI, M. & SAVITZ, L. (1976). The fear of crime in the school enterprise and its consequences. Education and Urban Society 8(4): 401-416.
- MILLER, W.B. 1962. The impact of a "total community" delinquency control project. Social Problems 10: 168-191.
- MOORE, JOAN W. 1991. Going Down To the Barrio. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- MOORE, J.W., VIGIL, J.D. & GARCIA, R. (1983). Residences and territoriality in chicano gangs. Social Problems 31(2): 182-194.
- MORALES, A. (1982). The Mexican American Gang Member: Evaluation and Treatment. Mental Health and Hispanic Americans (R.M. Becerra, M. Karno, and J.I. Escobar, eds.), pp. 139-155. New York: Grune and Stratton.

- MORASH, M. (1983). Gangs, groups, and delinquency. The British Journal of Criminology 23(4): 309-331.
- National Commission for Employment Policy (1982). Hispanics and Jobs: Barriers to Progress. Washington D.C.
- PEREZ, J., ORTET, G., PLA', S., & SIMO'. S. (1986). A junior sensation seeking scale (J-SSS). Personality Individual Differences 6(7): 915-918.
- RILEY, KEVIN W. 1991. Street Gangs and the Schools: A Blueprint for Intervention. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- RILEY, K., & HARRELL, D. 1990. Understanding Gangs: The Educator's Perspective, San Diego: San Diego City School.
- SCHAVE, D. & SCHAVE, B. 1989. Early Adolescence and the Search for Self. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- SEGRAVE, J.O. (1982). Delinquent behavior and interscholastic athletic participation. Journal of Sport Behavior 5: 96-111.
- STINCHCOMBE, A. 1964. Rebellion in a High School. Chicago: Quadrangle.
- SULLIVAN, M.L. 1989. Getting Paid: Youth Crime and Work in the Inner City. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- TAYLOR, C.S. 1990. Dangerous Society. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.
- THORNBURG, H.D. 1982. Development in Adolescence. Monterey, Calif: Brooks/Cole.
- THORNBURG, H.D. (1973). Behavior and values: consistency or inconsistency. Adolescence 8(32) 513-520.
- THORNE, G.L. (1971). Sensation-seeking scale with deviant populations. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 37(1): 106-110.
- THRASHER, F. 1927. The Gang. Chicago University of Chicago Press.
- VIGIL, J.D. (1983). Chicano gangs: One response to mexican urban adaptation in the Los Angeles area. Urban Anthropology 12(1): 45-75.

- VIGIL, J.D. (1988). Group processes and street identity: Adolescent Chicano Gang Members. Ethos 16(4): 421-445.
- VIGIL, J.D. 1988. Barrio Gangs - Street life and identity in Southern California. Texas: University of Texas Press.
- WHITE, H.S., LA BOUVIE, E.W. & BATES, M.E. (1985). The relationship between sensation seeking and delinquency: A longitudinal analysis. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 22(3): 197-211.
- WILLIAMS, T. 1989. The Cocaine Kids: The Inside Story of a Teenage Drug Ring. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- YABLONSKY, L. (1959). The delinquent gang as a near group. Social Problems: 108-117.
- YOUNISS, J. (1980) Parents and Peers in Social Development. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- ZUCKERMAN, M. & LINK, K. (1968). Construct validity for the sensation-seeking scale. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 32(4) 420-426.
- ZUCKERMAN, M., BONE, R., NEARY, R., MANGELSDORFF, D. & BRUSTMAN, B. (1971). What is the sensation seeker? Personality trait and experience correlates of the sensation-seeking scales. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 39: 308-21.
- ZUCKERMAN, M. EYSENECK, S. & EYSENECK, H.J. (1977). Sensation-seeking in England and America: Cross-cultural, age, and sex comparisons. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 46(1): 139-149.